

SENATOR MATZKE: I don't believe so.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: How many days will there be between the time this is brought to the Legislature and the time it would have to be passed on Final Reading?

SENATOR MATZKE: Between now and the 18th.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that's not three days, four days, five days or seven days for sure.

SENATOR MATZKE: It's nine days.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Legislative days.

SENATOR MATZKE: Well, today is the 9th of April.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me ask you this question. Do you think that a proposition such as this, which has had no public hearing and which attempts to state the boundaries of what the Supreme Court's authority are, would be accepted by the Supreme Court as a legitimate exercise of legislative authority?

SENATOR MATZKE: I believe it would, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And you say it's merely a procedural matter?

SENATOR MATZKE: It's a matter of establishing what opinions are precedents and what aren't.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And you say that's only a matter of procedure or is that substantive law? When the...if...when the...

SENATOR MATZKE: The distinction between procedural and substantive law is very ambiguous. I think it's primarily a procedural matter.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: When you are going to say that this court, this appellate court, can in effect make law on a case, and it will be the law until the Supreme Court changes it, is similar to us saying we can enact a law and it remains the law until we repeal it or the Supreme Court abolishes it. You say that making law, which would be allowed, to the appellate court is